

**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency**  
**Science Advisory Board**  
**Metals Assessment Panel**

Final Minutes of Public Conference Call Meeting August 8, 2002

**Committee:** Metals Assessment Panel of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Science Advisory Board (SAB). (See attached Roster)

**Date and Time:** August 8, 2002 from 2-4 Eastern Time (See attached Federal Register Notice)

**Location:** Science Advisory Board, Room 6013, Ariel Rios North, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave, Washington D.C.

**Purpose:** Three conference call meetings, including this one, were announced in 67 FEDERAL REGISTER, Number 46505-46506, July 15, 2002. At this meeting the Panel planned to: (a) Discuss the charge and review materials provided to the Metals Assessment Panel; (b) to clarify any questions relating to the charge and the review materials; (c) to discuss specific charge assignments to the panelists; and (d) to clarify specific points of interest raised by the Panelists in preparation for the face-to-face meeting to be held on September 10-12, 2002.

**Materials Available to the Panel:**

The following materials were sent August 1, 2002:

1. Draft Action Plan for the Development of a Framework for metals Assessment and Guidance for Characterizing and Ranking Metals (EPA/630/P-02/003A, June 2002)
2. Charge to the Panel
3. A Draft Agenda
4. Ethics Training for SGEs on a CD
5. The SAB's website where panelists and the public could read one another's bios and other materials related to the review  
<http://www.epa.gov/sab/metalspanel.html>

The following information was emailed August 7, 2002

1. A note from the chair welcoming the panelists and making assignments.

2. Identification of a website where the "Summary Report of the Meeting on Development of a Metals Assessment Framework" could be found. This summarizes a February 20, 2002, stakeholder meeting that provided input to the draft Action Plan. (<http://www.epa.gov/ncea/raf/rafpub.htm>)

The following materials were distributed at the meeting and made available afterwards by mail or email:

1. The Federal Register Notice announcing the meeting.
2. A panel roster
3. Biosketches of the panelists
4. A hand-out from Bill Wood which included the website address where the panelists could access public comments on the draft Metals Action Plan.

**Attendees:**

Because many people attended by conference call, they could not make use of the sign-in sheets. The sign-in sheets are attached. Here is a summary of those attending:

1. All panelists except Dr. Kim Hayes attended by conference call, SAB staff were present in person. Drs. Costa, Friedland, Fowler, O'Rourke, Pittinger, Thomas, Tran, Weiss, and Windom attended as did DFO Kathleen White and MA Zisa Lubaroov-Walton of the SAB staff. All these individuals are identified on the attached roster.
2. Agency staff Ed Bender (ORD/OAA/OSP), Alec McBride (OSWER/OSW/MRAD), Jim Rowe (ORD/OAA/OSP), Ed Ohanian (OW/OST/HECD), and Lisa Matthews (ORD/OAA/OSP), attended in person as did presenters Peggy Love (OGC/IO/DGC) and Bill Wood (ORD/NCEA/IO). Details on these individuals are provided on the sign-in sheets. Steve DeVito (OEI/OIAA/TRIPD), Mike Dusetzina (OAR/OAQPS/ESD), Kevin Minoli (OGC/PTSLO), Dave Mount (ORD/NHEERL-RTP/ADE) and Marc Stifelman (Region 10/OEA) attended by phone.
3. Debra Littleton of DOE attended by phone. Kevin Bromberg of the SBA attended in person.
4. John Arnett of the Copper & Brass Fabrications Council, Inc and Ann Smith-Reiser of Analytical Services, Inc. (a DOE contractor) attended in person. Bill Adams of Rio Tinto, Bill Allen of the Color Pigments Manufacturers Association, Mario Gamboa of the American Chemistry Council, Jane Luxton of King and Spalding, and Neil Shah of Risk Policy Report attended by phone.

## **Summary**

The meeting went largely according to the agenda.

Chair Valerie Thomas reminded the panel of the face-to-face meeting September 10-12. The purpose of holding three conference calls before the face-to-face meeting is to speed development of a report useful to the Agency on the draft Metals Action Plan. This call provides an ethics briefing and an overview of the draft Action Plan by the Agency. The August 15 call will provide the Panel with a range of perspectives on issues relating to the review. On August 29 the Panel has a chance to share their first drafts; EPA representatives will be available to answer questions.

She noted that the panel is being asked to review a plan, not a finished procedure or documents. Therefore there is a lot of opportunity to provide constructive input EPA can use to shape the framework and guidance.

EPA ethics attorney Peggy Love spoke about why EPA and the SAB take ethics seriously, noting that both President Bush and Governor Whitman had stressed the importance of maintaining the highest standards of integrity in government. The SAB works closely with EPA ethics attorney Ken Wernick. SAB was praised by the Office of Government Ethics (OGE) at a recent ethics conference for its new disclosure form and ethics training CD for Special Government Employees (SGEs). This panel used both. The Deputy Director of OGE noted that these may be models for all federal SGEs. The form and review procedures safeguard the SGEs as well as the government because they allow determination of whether there is a conflict of interest (COI) between private and public activities. (Special Government Employees are appointed to work for the government, not to exceed 130 days within a 360 day period, whether compensated or not.)

A conflict of interest is a personal interest or relationship, defined by law or regulation, that conflicts with the performance of your official duty. It's a very narrow rule. In most cases we are able to work around it through recusal (not too useful on an advisory committee), divestiture, and, in some cases, waivers if the government's need for your services exceeds the COI.

SAB designed ethics training for SGE's on CDs. These have been sent to the Panel. About half the panel have completed the training and have sent in the certificates. Others are having technical difficulties. EPA is interested in the panelists feedback on content and on practicalities.

Ms. Love cautioned the panelists that, while on the Metals Assessment Panel, it is important that they adhere to this standard. She mentioned some things panelists might run into, for example a reporter asking questions. These should be referred to the chair who will discuss with staff. The same approach generally applies to members of the public because we want to avoid having members of the panel being lobbied by members of the public.

Ms. Love responded to questions and then presented a hypothetical about a panelist who might be approached to provide a poster on lead for a colleague who was providing scientific support on a law suit. The reactions of the panelists were interesting, varied, and changed over time, which made it a really good hypothetical.

Bill Wood (Director of EPA's Risk Assessment Forum) chairs the technical panel to develop the MAP Action Plan. He gave a talk almost identical to his handout (attached) and answered some questions.

Questions about the role of the panel were addressed by the DFO and Bill Wood. The Panel is to review the Action Plan, not re-write the Action Plan. The Panel will be asked to review the Framework and the Guidance, not write them.

The chair also stated that the Panel is reviewing the Action Plan, not doing the Action Plan. She responded to other questions, noting that if, in the course of doing this review, panelists could also provide some additional helpful information, that would be fine. If panelists note that things are missing from the Action Plan, they can bring that to the Agency's attention. For example, "You have completely missed X. The reasons it is important to include X are a,b,c. If you were to include X, then you might want to take this approach . . ." Ideally, it would be great if by August 29 you could begin to tell us what X is so that then, as a Panel, we can discuss this. This is why we are trying to start early, so we can be engaged in this discussion when we meet in September.

Bill Wood responded to questions on the synergistic effects of various metals and the thought process that lead EPA to conclude that health and eco should be combined. EPA started by seeing if there was a framework that could be applied to both health and eco. They wanted to see whether a holistic approach would work. They didn't address synergistic effects and would welcome the panel's input. One panelist thought synergy was imbedded in speciation on page 8. Other panelists thought synergistic effects should be addressed particularly because of applications at Superfund sites and because they affected a variety of receptors.

One panelist, noting that EPA stressed this is a cross-Agency framework, asked for a better understanding of how various offices make risk-based policy decisions. A summary table of key statutes and how they were implemented would be helpful; it does not need to be comprehensive. For example, the table might address how background levels are treated. Debra Littleton of DOE offered to provide a document that does some of this for lead. The chair, DFO, panelist and Bill Wood will talk to scope out what such a table might look like.

Another panelist noted that global transport is key to risk assessment of certain metals and suggested that an overview table showing how various Agencies or offices view global atmospheric transport would be helpful. The chair, DFO, panelist and Bill Wood will talk to scope out what such a table might look like.

Bill Wood emphasized the importance of the scenarios in the Action Plan and

suggested that when the panelists were considering recommendations they ask themselves: How would I deal with that in a site-specific situation? in an analysis to support national regulations? A simple ranking?

There were no more Subcommittee questions.

Debra Littleton had a couple of questions for Bill Wood.

After this discussion, the chair, began to organize the panel for the review. She would like a rough draft by August 29 and has made preliminary writing assignments by charge question to achieve that end. The rough draft is an exercise in beginning to write with no expectation that the draft in any way reflects the final views of the panel. She would like the responses posted on a website before August 29, if possible. The write-ups can be very informal – bullet outlines circulated by email would be fine.

For the September meeting, the chair would like more polished write-ups, not what panelists would submit to a peer reviewed journal, but approaching it, with references. The conference calls and face-to-face meetings will be run like scientific discussions with the free expression of ideas, trying things out, being outspoken, etc. because that is how the panel will get to a final product.

The DFO read out the assignments, emphasizing that the questions are broad and all are expected to contribute widely, however there are writing teams because someone needs to be responsible for getting the writing done. She also asked that people minimize formatting in their writing and use MSWord 95, MSWord 98 or Wordperfect where possible. The DFO uses Wordperfect 8 and there are conversion problems with MSWord 2000. The assignments of charge questions to panelists were:

1. Please comment on the soundness of the proposed organizing principles suggested by the public that are reflected in the draft Action Plan for the "Framework for Metals Assessment and Cross-Agency Guidance for Assessing Metals-Related Hazard and Risk." (The proposed organizing principles, listed in section 1 of the draft Action Plan, include the following: providing a basis for identifying and prioritizing among metals, metal alloys and other metal compounds with respect to hazard and risk, use of sound science, use of a tiered approach, recognition of the influence of bioavailability on toxicity, and initially focus on hazard assessment as a screening tool.)

**Fowler**, Pittinger, O'Rourke

2. Are the issues raised in the Action Plan - chemical speciation, bioavailability, bioaccumulation, persistence, and toxicity - the major issues of concern for improving EPA's scientific assessments of the hazards and risks of metals?

**Costa**, Hayes, Friedland

3. Has EPA adequately characterized the issues and do the summaries adequately capture the key scientific uncertainties that will need to be addressed by the Framework and the Guidance?

Hayes, Windom

4. Can the SAB suggest priorities within the list of issues based on (a) the potential impact on the assessment of risk or hazard and (b) the state-of-the-science and the feasibility of developing guidance in the near term?

**O'Rourke**, Tran

5. Are there specific recommendations for the Framework or for the "Guidance for Characterization and Ranking of Metals" (including methods and models) for addressing these issues that are not captured by EPA's Action Plan?

**Tran**, Fowler

6. Please comment on the feasibility of the proposed process for drafting the Framework and the Guidance. Will the timeline allow for the scientific issues to be adequately addressed? Are the measures being taken to involve the scientific community and the public adequate?

**Weiss**, Windom

7. Please comment on the outline for the Framework and the description of the Guidance. Is it clear and all-inclusive?

**Pittinger**, Costa

8. Are there any additional actions, beyond those proposed in the Action Plan that could improve EPA's scientific assessments of the hazard and risks of metals?

**Friedland**, Weiss

Panelists may email materials to their team leader with copies to the DFO. The DFO will collect and disburse writings. Dr. Weiss noted that, in his experience, where DFO isn't involved, things do get out of hand.

Dr. Thomas adjourned the meeting at 4:00.

Respectfully Submitted:

**/ Signed /**

---

Ms. Kathleen Conway  
Designated Federal Official  
Environmental Engineering Committee

Certified as True:

**/ Signed /**

---

Dr. Valerie Thomas, Chair

**Attachments**

1. Federal Register notice
2. Agenda for the meeting
3. Committee roster
4. Cover Letter for Mailing of August 1\*
5. Charge
6. Emailing of August 7
7. Bill Wood's Hand-out used in presentation\*
8. Sign-in sheets

\* The FACA file for this meeting contains the letter with all attachments, including the review document, the summary of the February 20, 2002 meeting provided as background, and the five public comments provided to the Agency on the draft Metals Action Plan

## ATTACHMENT 1

EPA Science Advisory Board, Notification of Public Advisory Committee Meetings;  
Metals Assessment Panel

[Federal Register: July 15, 2002 (Volume 67, Number 135)]

[Notices]

[Page 46505-46506]

From the Federal Register Online via GPO Access [[wais.access.gpo.gov](http://wais.access.gpo.gov)]

[DOCID:fr15jy02-60]

-----  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY [FRL-7245-4]

EPA Science Advisory Board, Notification of Public Advisory  
Committee Meetings; Metals Assessment Panel

Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, notice is hereby given of three conference call meetings of Metals Assessment Panel of the US EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB). These conference call meetings are preparatory for a face-to-face meeting to be held September 10-12 in or near Washington DC. Once the location is known, the face-to-face meeting will be the subject of a separate announcement. The Panel will hold conference calls on the dates and times noted below. All times noted are Eastern Time. All meetings are open to the public, however, seating is limited and available on a first come basis. For teleconference meetings, available lines may also be limited.

Important Notice: Documents that are the subject of SAB reviews are normally available from the originating EPA office and are not available from the SAB Office--information concerning availability of documents from the relevant Program Office is included below.

### Background

The EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB, Board) announced in 67 FR 38957-38959, June 6, 2002 that it had been asked to undertake a review of EPA's draft Action Plan for the "Framework for Metals Assessment and Cross-Agency Guidance for Assessing Metals-Related Hazard and Risk." The background, charge, and description of the review documents appear in the above referenced Federal Register notice and are also available at the SAB website ([www.epa.gov/sab](http://www.epa.gov/sab)). The notice also included a call for nominations for members of the panel in certain technical expertise areas needed to address the charge and described the process to be used in forming the panel. A Short List of individuals from which the panel will be chosen has been posted at the SAB's website.

The following three teleconference meetings will be hosted out of Conference Room 6013, USEPA, Ariel Rios Building North, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington,



DC 20004. The meetings are all open to the public, but, due to limited space, seating will be on a first-come basis. The SAB Staff encourages members of the public who plan to attend any or all of the three meetings in person to call a few days in advance of that meeting and to arrive at least 15 minutes before the scheduled start time so that the necessary building security requirements can be accommodated before the start of the meeting. The public may also attend the teleconference meetings via telephone, however, lines may be limited. For further information concerning the meetings or how to obtain the teleconference phone number, please contact the individuals listed at the end of this FR notice.

#### 1. Metals Assessment Panel--August 8, 2002 Teleconference

The Metals Assessment Panel will meet on August 8, 2002 by teleconference from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. Eastern Time. Purpose of the Meeting--The purpose of this public teleconference meeting is to: (a) Discuss the charge and review materials provided to the Metals Assessment Panel; (b) to clarify any questions relating to the charge and the review materials; (c) to discuss specific charge assignments to the panelists; and (d) to clarify specific points of interest raised by the Panelists in preparation for the face-to-face meeting to be held on September 10-12, 2002.

See below for availability of review materials, the charge to the review panel, and contact information.

#### 2. Metals Assessment Panel--August 15, 2002 Teleconference

The Metals Assessment Panel will meet on August 15, 2002 by teleconference from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. Eastern Time. Purpose of the Meeting--The purpose of this public teleconference meeting is to: (a) Hear invited presentations; (b) to hear public comment; (c) to provide an opportunity for panel discussion; and (d) to identify areas where the Panel would welcome additional input.

See below for availability of review materials, the charge to the review panel, and contact information.

#### 3. Metals Assessment Panel--August 29, 2002 Teleconference

The Metals Assessment Panel will meet on August 29, 2002 by teleconference from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. Eastern Time. Purpose of the Meeting--The purpose of this public teleconference meeting is to: (a) Allow panelists to identify points they think should be addressed in the Panel's report; (b) provide other panelists with an opportunity to add to or correct those points; and (c) identify for the Agency and the Public any areas where the panel would welcome additional information or comment.

See below for availability of review materials, the charge to the review panel, and contact information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Persons desiring information about public participation in the meetings identified above must contact Kathleen White, Designated Federal Officer, Metals Assessment Panel, USEPA Science Advisory Board

(1400A), Suite 6450Z, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20460; telephone/voice mail at (202) 564-4559; fax at (202) 501-0582; or via e-mail at [white.kathleen@epa.gov](mailto:white.kathleen@epa.gov).

Requests for oral comments must be made in writing (e-mail, fax or mail) and received by Ms. White no later than noon Eastern Time on the following dates: for the August 8 teleconference call, requests must be received by August 1st; for the August 15 teleconference call, requests must be received by August 8; for the August 29 conference call, requests must be received by August 22.

The public is encouraged to provide written comments. Those who prefer to provide oral comments are encouraged to schedule them for August 15. The oral public comment period will be limited and divided among the speakers who register. Additional opportunities for public comment will be available at the face to face meeting to be held September 10-12. Registration is on a first come basis. Speakers who have been granted time on the agenda may not yield their time to other speakers. Speakers who are unable to register in time may provide their comments in writing.

Members of the public desiring additional information about the meeting locations or the call-in number for the teleconference before June 30, 2002, must contact Ms. Zisa Lubarov-Walton, Management Assistant, EPA

[[Page 46506]]

Science Advisory Board (1400A), Suite 6450N, U.S. EPA, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20460; telephone/voice mail at (202) 564-4537; fax at (202) 501-0582; or via e-mail at [lubarov-walton.zisa@epa.gov](mailto:lubarov-walton.zisa@epa.gov)

A copy of the draft agenda for each meeting will be posted on the SAB Website ([www.epa.gov/sab](http://www.epa.gov/sab)) (under the AGENDAS subheading) approximately 10 days before that meeting.

Availability of Review Material--There is one primary document that is the subject of the review. The draft Metals Action Plan is available on the EPA Risk Assessment Forum's website: <http://www.epa.gov/ncea/raf/rafpub.htm>. The review document is also available electronically at the following site [http://oaspub.epa.gov/eims/eimscomm.getfile?p\\_download\\_id=4580](http://oaspub.epa.gov/eims/eimscomm.getfile?p_download_id=4580) For questions and information pertaining to the review documents, please contact Dr. Bill Wood (Mail Code 8601D), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC 20460; tel. (202) 564-3358, e-mail: [wood.bill@epa.gov](mailto:wood.bill@epa.gov). Dr. Wood will refer you to the appropriate contact for the particular issue of interest.

### Providing Oral or Written Comments at SAB Meetings

It is the policy of the EPA Science Advisory Board to accept written public comments of any length, and to accommodate oral public comments whenever possible. The EPA Science Advisory Board expects that public statements presented at its meetings will not be repetitive of previously submitted oral or written statements.

Oral Comments: In general, each individual or group requesting an oral presentation at a face-to-face meeting will be limited to a total time of ten minutes (unless otherwise indicated). For teleconference meetings, opportunities for oral comment will usually be

limited to no more than three minutes per speaker and no more than fifteen minutes total. Deadlines for getting on the public speaker list for a meeting are given above. Speakers should bring at least 35 copies of their comments and presentation slides for distribution to the reviewers and public at the meeting.

Written Comments: Although the SAB accepts written comments until the date of the meeting (unless otherwise stated), written comments should be received in the SAB Staff Office at least one week prior to the meeting date so that the comments may be made available to the review panel for their consideration. Comments should be supplied to the appropriate DFO at the address/contact information noted above in the following formats: one hard copy with original signature, and one electronic copy via e-mail (acceptable file format: Adobe Acrobat, WordPerfect, Word, or Rich Text files (in IBM-PC/Windows 95/98 format). Those providing written comments and who attend the meeting are also asked to bring 35 copies of their comments for public distribution.

Meeting Access--Individuals requiring special accommodation at this meeting, including wheelchair access to the conference room, should contact Ms. White at least five business days prior to the meeting so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

General Information--Additional information concerning the Science Advisory Board, its structure, function, and composition, may be found on the SAB Website (<http://www.epa.gov/sab>) and in the Science Advisory Board FY2001 Annual Staff Report which is available from the SAB Publications Staff at (202) 564-4533 or via fax at (202) 501-0256.

Dated: July 9, 2002.  
Robert Flaak,  
Acting Deputy Director, EPA Science Advisory Board.  
[FR Doc. 02-17691 Filed 7-12-02; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## ATTACHMENT 2

### SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD - METALS ASSESSMENT PANEL CONFERENCE CALL MEETING

August 8, 2002

Room 6013 Ariel Rios Building, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW

Washington DC

Final Draft Agenda of August 1

2:00 Mechanics of Call, Calling the Roll

Kathleen White, DFO

2:05 Opening Remarks

Valerie Thomas, Chair

2:10 Ethics

Peggy Love, EPA/OGC

1. Ethics and Government Ethics
  - a. Why EPA and SAB take them seriously
  - b. EPA's Principles of Scientific Integrity
  - c. Why the panel should take them seriously
2. Ethics, this Panel, the Press and the Public
  - a. What staff and panel have already done
  - b. What staff and panel must continue to do while on the panel
    - i. dealings with the press
    - ii. dealing with peers
    - iii. dealing with the public
  - c. What staff and panel may - and may not - do after the panel has finished its work
3. Questions and Discussion
  - a. Questions for the panel on ethics
  - b. Questions from the panel on ethics
  - c. Panels comments on the SGE Ethics CD

2:40 Agency Briefings on the Review Document

Bill Wood, EPA/ORD and  
colleagues

1. Introduction of EPA Writing Group Members
2. Presentation led by Bill Wood
  - a. Overview and Charge Questions
  - b. Context
  - c. Quick Overview of the major sections.
  - d. Overview of comments from the public
3. Q&A
4. Discussion of the documents
5. Panelists identify for the Agency where more information would be helpful to their review.

3:30 Organization of the Panel's Work and Practicalities Valerie Thomas, chair

1. Preliminary writing assignments that establish writing teams by charge question. Discussion of expectations about written contributions.
2. How to make DFO's life easier – limit formatting and use WordPerfect or MSWord 95 rather than MSWord2000
3. Reminders about August 15 and August 29 conference calls

**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Science Advisory Board  
Executive Committee  
Metals Assessment Panel\***

**CHAIR**

**Dr. Valerie Thomas**, Research Scientist, , Princeton Environmental Institute, Guyot Hall Room 28, Princeton, NJ

Also Member: Environmental Engineering Committee

**OTHER SAB MEMBERS**

**Dr. Charles A. Pittinger**, Director of Environmental Research and Program Manager, SoBran, Incorporated, Cincinnati, OH

Member: Ecological Processes and Effects Committee

**CONSULTANTS**

**Dr. Max Costa**, Professor and Chairman, Department of Environmental Medicine, School of Medicine, New York University, New York, NY

**Dr. Bruce Fowler**, Professor of Epidemiology and Toxicology, University of Maryland Program in Toxicology , University of Maryland , Baltimore, MD

**Dr. Andrew Friedland**, Professor, Environmental Studies Program, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH

**Dr. Kim Hayes**, Associate Professor of Environmental Engineering, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, , University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

**Dr. Mary Kay O'Rourke**, Associate Professor of Public Health Research & Medicine, College of Public Health, University of Arizona, ,

**Dr. Nga L. Tran**, Senior Managing Scientist, Exponent/AKA Novigen Sciences, Washington, DC

**Dr. Bernard Weiss**, Professor, Department of Environmental Medicine, University of Rochester Medical Center, Rochester, NY

**Dr. Herbert L. Windom**, Professor, Skidaway Institute of Oceanography, Savannah, GA

## **SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD STAFF**

\* Members of this SAB Panel consist of

a. SAB Members: Experts appointed by the Administrator to serve on one of the SAB Standing Committees.

b. SAB Consultants: Experts appointed by the SAB Staff Director to a one-year term to serve on ad hoc Panels formed to address a particular issue.

c. Liaisons: Members of other Federal Advisory Committees who are not Members or Consultants of the Board.

d. Federal Experts: The SAB charter precludes Federal employees from being Members of the Board. "Federal Experts" are federal employees who have technical knowledge and expertise relevant to the subject matter under review or study by a particular panel.

**G:\SAB\RostersPDB\EC-MAP-ExtRost-08-06-2002.WPD**

## ATTACHMENT 4

August 1, 2002

Metals Assessment Panel  
Science Advisory Board

Dear Madam Chair and Panelists,

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the U.S. EPA Science Advisory Board's Metals Assessment Panel, which will operate as a subcommittee of the Executive Committee.

This letter transmits the document to be reviewed and an ethics course on CD to be taken. It also reminds you of the meeting dates and provides a website where information about this review can be found.

(1) The review document is *Draft Action Plan for the Development of a Framework for Metals Assessment and Guidance for Characterizing and Ranking Metals*. It is about thirty pages long and I hope you will at least give it a light reading before the panel's first conference call August 8. The document and charge are enclosed. Two public comments on the document will be made available to you later.

(2) The SAB is in the process of developing an ethics course on CD for its members and consultants. All SAB staff took it and suggested improvements. The latest draft is enclosed for you. The CD is auto-run, so it should come up when you place it in the CD section of your computer, but it may take a few minutes. One of our staff has personally checked each of the CDs and they work here, so they should work for you. Within the training is a video - this does take a while to come up.

Please take the training on CD before the August 8 conference call, print the certificate and fax it to me at 202 501 0582. If you have any difficulties with the training, any comments, praise or frustrations, please provide those as well so that we can improve the training.

(3) The conference calls will be held from 2-4 p.m. **EASTERN** Time on August 8, 15, and 29. The face-to-face meeting will be for three full days September 10-12 in Crystal City, Virginia, convenient to National Airport. Unless you have made prior arrangements with me, you will call into the conference bridge. The phone numbers and access codes are:

Date	Call In Number	Access Code
August 8	202 260 1005	2935#
August 15	202 260 8330	2331#
August 29	202 260 7280	6223#



A copy of the agenda for the first conference call is enclosed

(4) The website is: <http://www.epa.gov/sab/metalspanel.html>

At that location you can find a link to the review document: (*Draft Action Plan for the Development of a Framework for Metals Assessment and Guidance for Characterizing and Ranking Metals*), A Federal Register Notice containing the charge (Request for Nominations Federal Register Notice), biosketches for your fellow panelists drawn from the Short List (Invitation for Comment on Prospective Candidates to the SAB's Metals Assessment Panel), and a Federal Register Notice announcing the three conference calls (Federal Register Notice, August 8, 2002 Meeting; August 15, 2002 Meeting; August 29, 2002 Meeting).

I very much look forward to working with you on this review. I will be in touch with you more by email shortly.

Sincerely,

Kathleen E. White  
Designated Federal Official  
Science Advisory Board Staff

Enclosures: Draft of the Action Plan  
Ethics CD  
Charge to the Panel (from the FR)  
Agenda for August 8 conference call

cc: FACA File for August 8, 2002

**Charge to the Panel**

(from Federal Register Notice of June 6, 2002)

1. Please comment on the soundness of the proposed organizing principles suggested by the public that are reflected in the draft Action Plan for the "Framework for Metals Assessment and Cross-Agency Guidance for Assessing Metals-Related Hazard and Risk." (The proposed organizing principles, listed in section 1 of the draft Action Plan, include the following: providing a basis for identifying and prioritizing among metals, metal alloys and other metal compounds with respect to hazard and risk, use of sound science, use of a tiered approach, recognition of the influence of bioavailability on toxicity, and initially focus on hazard assessment as a screening tool.)
2. Are the issues raised in the Action Plan--chemical speciation, bioavailability, bioaccumulation, persistence, and toxicity--the major issues of concern for improving EPA's scientific assessments of the hazards and risks of metals?
3. Has EPA adequately characterized the issues and do the summaries adequately capture the key scientific uncertainties that will need to be addressed by the Framework and the Guidance?
4. Can the SAB suggest priorities within the list of issues based on (a) the potential impact on the assessment of risk or hazard and (b) the state-of-the-science and the feasibility of developing guidance in the near term?
5. Are there specific recommendations for the Framework or for the "Guidance for Characterization and Ranking of Metals" (including methods and models) for addressing these issues that are not captured by EPA's Action Plan?
6. Please comment on the feasibility of the proposed process for drafting the Framework and the Guidance. Will the timeline allow for the scientific issues to be adequately addressed? Are the measures being taken to involve the scientific community and the public adequate?
7. Please comment on the outline for the Framework and the description of the Guidance. Is it clear and all-inclusive?
8. Are there any additional actions, beyond those proposed in the Action Plan that could improve EPA's scientific assessments of the hazard and risks of metals?

## ATTACHMENT 6

To: SAB Metals Assessment Plan (MAP) Review Panel  
From: Valerie Thomas, Panel Chair  
Date: August 7, 2002

Thank you all for agreeing to serve on the MAP review. Since our first conference call is tomorrow, I've put together a few notes to help you get started. If you could spend a short amount of time on this before tomorrow's conference call, I recommend reading the Metals Action Plan, the Charge Questions and your Assignments, and taking a look at the "Summary Report of the Meeting."

Metals Action Plan: The document we will be reviewing is the Metals Action Plan: (Draft Action Plan For the Development of a Framework for Metals Assessment), which you can download from the SAB site if you don't have it already. (<http://www.epa.gov/sab/metalspanel.html>).

If you can, please give this a quick read before our August 8 conference call.

Background: For background, you may also want to read the "Summary Report of the Meeting on Development of a Metals Assessment Framework." This summarizes a February 20, 2002, stakeholder meeting that provided input to the document we are reviewing. This Summary Report is available at the EPA site, <http://www.epa.gov/ncea/raf/rafpub.htm>

Your Assignments: The charge to our panel is given below, and each of you has been assigned responsibility for at least two of the questions. The first person listed has lead responsibility for coordinating the response to that question. Because all the charge questions are broad, all of you are invited and encouraged to respond to any of the charge questions; the purpose of the specific assignments is to ensure that each charge question will be fully addressed in the final report. For August 29, please develop a short, preliminary, non-consensus, written draft of your responses; a bullet-style outline in e-mail format would be fine.

### Charge to the Panel:

1. Please comment on the soundness of the proposed organizing principles suggested by the public that are reflected in the draft Action Plan for the "Framework for Metals Assessment and Cross-Agency Guidance for Assessing Metals-Related Hazard and Risk." (The proposed organizing principles, listed in section 1 of the draft Action Plan, include the following: providing a basis for identifying and prioritizing among metals, metal alloys and other metal compounds with respect to hazard and risk, use of sound science, use of a tiered approach, recognition of the influence of bioavailability on toxicity, and initially focus on hazard assessment as a screening tool.)

Fowler, Pittinger, O'Rourke

2. Are the issues raised in the Action Plan - chemical speciation, bioavailability, bioaccumulation, persistence, and toxicity - the major issues of concern for improving EPA's scientific assessments of the hazards and risks of metals?

Costa, Hayes, Friedland

3. Has EPA adequately characterized the issues and do the summaries adequately capture the key scientific uncertainties that will need to be addressed by the Framework and the Guidance?

Hayes, Windom

4. Can the SAB suggest priorities within the list of issues based on (a) the potential impact on the assessment of risk or hazard and (b) the state-of-the-science and the feasibility of developing guidance in the near term?

O'Rourke, Tran

5. Are there specific recommendations for the Framework or for the "Guidance for Characterization and Ranking of Metals" (including methods and models) for addressing these issues that are not captured by EPA's Action Plan?

Tran, Fowler

6. Please comment on the feasibility of the proposed process for drafting the Framework and the Guidance. Will the timeline allow for the scientific issues to be adequately addressed? Are the measures being taken to involve the scientific community and the public adequate?

Weiss, Windom

7. Please comment on the outline for the Framework and the description of the Guidance. Is it clear and all-inclusive?

Pittinger, Costa

8. Are there any additional actions, beyond those proposed in the Action Plan that could improve EPA's scientific assessments of the hazard and risks of metals?

Friedland, Weiss

--

Valerie Thomas

Research Scientist

Princeton Environmental Institute

Guyot Hall, Room 28

Princeton University, Princeton NJ 08544 USA

tel: (609) 258-4665

fax: (609) 258-1716

<http://www.princeton.edu/~vmthomas>